

09/607,560

MS147163.01/MSFTP120US

REMARKS**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Claims 1-24 and 26-41 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 3, 15-19, 22, and 26-28 have been amended. Claims 1-2, 20-21, 23 and 29-30 have been canceled in order to place the subject application in condition for allowance and will be pursued in a continuation application. New claims 31-41 have been added.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conference of September 28, 2004, where it was agreed that the herein amendments (incorporating allowable subject matter into the independent claims) would place the application in condition for allowance. In particular, claims 3-15, 17, 19, 22 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants' representative has rewritten claims 3, 15, 17, 19 and 22 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 is the base claim from which claims 4-14 depend. By virtue of this dependency, claims 4-14 contain all of the limitations of claim 3 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Claim 24 depends from claim 22 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 22. Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully requests that claims 3-15, 17, 19, 22 and 24 be allowed.

Regarding new claims 31-37, claim 22 is the base claim for these claims. By virtue of this dependency, claims 31-37 include all the limitations of claim 22, and therefore, claims 31-37 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 22. Likewise, new claims 38-39 depend from claim 24. By virtue of this dependency, claims 38-39 contain all of the limitations of claim 24, and therefore, claims 38-39 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 24. New claims 40-41 depend from claim 3. By virtue of this dependency, claims 40-41 include all limitations of claim 3, and therefore, claims 40-41 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully requests that new claims 31-41 be allowed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

09/607,560

MS147163.01/MSFTP120US

**I. Rejection of Claims 1, 20, 21, 23, 26, 29 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1, 20-21, 23, 26, and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) because the Examiner contends that these claims are anticipated by Greger Lindén, "Structured Document Transformation," 1997, University of Helsinki, Finland, Series of Publications A, Report A-1997-2 ("*Lindén*"). Claims 1, 20-21, 23, and 29-30 have been canceled and will be pursued in a continuation application. Claim 26 has been amended to depend from claim 22, which the Examiner indicated was allowable if rewritten in independent form. (See Final Office Action dated Sept. 1, 2004 at p. 12). Applicants' representative has amended claim 22 to be in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By virtue of its dependency, claim 26 contains all of the limitations of claim 22 and therefore, claim 26 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 22. Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn and that claim 26 be allowed.

**II. Rejection of Claims 2 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 2 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) because the Examiner contends that these claims are obvious over *Lindén* in view of Alfred V. Aho *et al.* "Compilers: Principles, Techniques, and Tools," 1986 Addison-Wesley ("*Aho et al.*"). Claim 2 has been canceled and will be pursued in a continuation application. Claim 16 has been amended to depend from claim 3, which the Examiner indicated was allowable if rewritten in independent form. (See Final Office Action dated Sept. 1, 2004 at p. 12). Applicants' representative has amended claim 3 to be in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By virtue of its dependency, claim 16 contains all of the limitations of claim 3 and therefore, claim 16 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn and that claim 16 be allowed.

**III. Rejection of Claims 18 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 18 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) because the Examiner contends that these claims are obvious over *Lindén* in view of Alberto Bellina, "XmlTool documentation," 21 January 2003 ("*Bellina*"). Claim 18 has been amended to depend from claim 3, which the

09/607,560

MS147163.01/MSFTP120US

Examiner indicated was allowable if rewritten in independent form. (See Final Office Action dated Sept. 1, 2004 at p. 12). Applicants' representative has amended claim 3 to be in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By virtue of its dependency, claim 18 contains all of the limitations of claim 3 and therefore, claim 18 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn and that claim 18 be allowed.

Claim 28 has been amended to depend from claim 22, which the Examiner indicated was allowable if rewritten in independent form. (See Final Office Action dated Sept. 1, 2004 at p. 12). Applicants' representative has rewritten claim 22 to be in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By virtue of its dependency, claim 28 contains all of the limitations of claim 22 and therefore, claim 28 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 22. Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 28 be withdrawn and that claim 28 be allowed.

**IV. Rejection of Claim 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) because the Examiner contends that this claim is obvious over *Lindén*. Claim 27 has been amended to depend from claim 22, which the Examiner indicated was allowable if rewritten in independent form. (See Final Office Action dated Sept. 1, 2004 at p. 12). Applicants' representative has rewritten claim 22 to be in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By virtue of its dependency, claim 27 contains all of the limitations of claim 2 and therefore, claim 27 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 22. Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 27 be withdrawn and that claim 27 be allowed.

09/607,560

MS147163.01/MSFTP120US

**Conclusion**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**